UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,625	01/31/2005	Takashi Imoto	03500.017510.	1853

5514   7590   05/04/2010
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
ZHANG, FAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 March 2010*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.
      4a) Of the above claim(s) *9 and 10* is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 11-14* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since

this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee

set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office

action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

March 02, 2010 has been entered.

Applicant's request for terminating the suspension of action incorporated in an

interview summary was received on April 26, 2010. A response to RCE of March 03,

2010 was subsequently resumed.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's remarks respective to amended claim 1 have been fully considered.

Applicant's arguments are moot in view of a new ground of rejection.

Response to Amendments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
> a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-6, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gallacher (US Pub: 2003/0227647) and in further view of

Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790), Calaway (US Pub: 2002/0012134), and Tsao

(US Patent: 7,418,702).

          Regarding claim 1 (Currently Amended), Gallacher teaches: A notifying

method of notifying a user of information regarding an image processing apparatus

which communicates with an information processing apparatus wherein the information

processing apparatus can simultaneously provide, for each user who log-on to an

operating system of the information processing apparatus, an environment, as an

independent user session, in which a program desired by the user can be activated, the

method comprising: a print data transmitting step of transmitting print data to the image

processing apparatus [p0018]; a receiving step of receiving the information regarding

the image processing apparatus, the receiving step being started by one of the user

sessions for a predetermined one of the plurality of users activating a first display

program, the information being sent from the image processing apparatus without

waiting for a request from the predetermined user [p0022, p0024, p0030, p0032

(Receiving notification is being started by activating a first display program illustrated in

figs. 4 and 5. The notification would pop-up on a user's display automatically without

waiting for the user's request.)];

          an activating step of activating a second display program corresponding to the

active session specified in the specifying step in order to display the information

regarding the image processing apparatus received in the receiving step on the display

unit occupied in the specified active session; an information transmitting step of, if the

second display program is activated in the activating step, transmitting the information

received in the receiving step to the activated second display program; and a displaying

step of displaying, in response to the information transmitting step transmitting the

received information, the transmitted information on the display unit of the information

processing apparatus occupied in the active session through the second display

program [p0024, p0032, p0035 (The specified active session here is login session. The

second display program is activated when another user who is assigned as a

notification receiver in fig. 5 properly logs on to the information processing apparatus.

The notification pop-up window operates based on username so it would not be

transmitted to or displayed for those that are not designated viewers or if a designated

viewer does not log on.)].

        To further illustrate the feature that certain print status information only pops up

on a screen after a proper user name is entered, Nishiyama of the same field of

endeavor disclose it in [figs. 16 and 17]. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an

ordinary skilled in the art to apply combine teaching of the two to activate a notification

display program based on proper login for security reason.

        Gallacher does not describe a situation in which a plurality of users

simultaneously logon to the operating system of a single information processing

apparatus. In the same field of endeavor, both Calaway and Tsao teach: for each of a

plurality of users who simultaneously log-on to an operating system of the information

processing apparatus, an environment, as an independent user session, in which a

program desired by the user can be activated; a specifying step of specifying an active

session from among the independent user sessions for another of the plurality of users,

who simultaneously log-on to the operating system of the information processing

apparatus, different from the predetermined user, wherein the other user can

exclusively occupy a display unit of the information processing apparatus to operate the

information processing apparatus and wherein the active session occupies the display

unit of the information processing apparatus in which the plurality of users

simultaneously log-on to the operating system [Calaway: p0079, p0080, Tsao: Abstract].

Having a plurality of user logon to a single computer/server simultaneously and allowing

each user to exclusively occupy a display unit of the computer/server have been well

known in the art as prescribed by both Calaway and Tsao. Therefore, giving

Gallacher's teaching on automatic pop-up notification to designated users who log on

various computers and Calaway and Tsao's teaching on multiple user simultaneously

logging on a single computer, it would have been an obvious alternative for an ordinary

skilled in the art to substitute one single information processing apparatus for a plurality

of information processing apparatuses to allow notification pop-up windows to be

transmitted to and displayed on the screen of the information processing apparatus

once a proper user logs on so that multiple users who share the same information

processing apparatus would obtain the corresponding print job information for the

purposes of space reservation and resource sharing.

Regarding claim 2 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method

according to claim 1, further comprising: an existence information receiving step of

receiving existence information showing that the display program has been activated in

the specified active session [p0072-p0075, figs. 14-17]; and an activation discriminating

step of discriminating whether the display program has been activated in the specified

active session on the basis of the received existence information [fig. 13: units S52 and

S54], wherein the information transmitting step transmits the information received in the

receiving step to the display program activated in the specified active session if the

activation discrimination step discriminates that the display program has been activated

[fig. 13: units S53, S55-S57].

Regarding claim 3 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method

according to claim 1, further comprising a step of, if a plurality of display programs have

been activated by the active session specified in the specifying step, finishing one of the

plurality of display programs [figs. 4, 9, 12, and 13: END].

Regarding claim 4 (Previously Presented), the rationale applied to the

rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method

according to claim 1, wherein the display program is a program for displaying

information regarding a print job issued to the image processing apparatus or

information regarding a status of the image processing apparatus [p0067].

Regarding claim 5 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 4 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method

according to claim 4, further comprising: a user specifying step of specifying the user

corresponding to the active session in which the display program has been activated;

and an issuance discriminating step of discriminating whether the print job of the user

specified in the user specifying step has been issued to the image processing

apparatus, wherein if it is determined that the print job has not been issued in the

issuance discriminating step, the display program is not activated [p0074]. In

Nishiyama's teaching, print jobs are divided between confidential and common. The

confidential print display program will not be activated unless user specification and job

issued by the user are confirmed. Although a common print status display program is

activated, confidential print status display program is not activated as it is discriminated

that Tanaka has not issued a print job as exemplified in p0074. However, all the print

jobs could be converted to confidential status so that none of the display programs

would be activated. Therefore, it would have been an obvious variation of Nishiyama's

exemplification for an ordinary skilled in the art to apply confidential print status to all the

print jobs so that none of the display programs will be activated when user does not

issue a print job for the purpose of simplicity and less confusion.

Regarding claim 6 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method according to claim 1, further comprising: a necessity discriminating step of discriminating whether the information is information which needs to be displayed on the basis of the information received in the receiving step [fig. 13: units S52 and S54], wherein the display program is activated in the active session specified in the specifying step if the necessity discriminating step discriminates that the information is the information which needs to be displayed [fig. 13: units S53-57]. Also see [p0067-p0070].

Claim 11 (Currently Amended) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 1.

Claim 12 (Currently Amended) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to claim 1 and in accordance with Nishiyama's further teaching on: A computer-readable memory medium which stores a program for controlling an information processing apparatus [p0088].

Regarding claim 14 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teach: A method according to claim 1, wherein the specifying step specifies the active session for the other user different from the predetermined user based on information obtained in a step of obtaining active session information in order to discriminate the active session

occupying the display unit used by the other user from the user sessions [figs. 15-17:

User Name & Password entry (The active session of user name & password entry

specifies one of a plurality of users to obtain information regarding the image processing

apparatus.)].

5.   Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gallacher (US Pub: 2003/0227647), Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790),

Calaway (US Pub: 2002/0012134), and Tsao (US Patent: 7,418,702); and in further

view of Parry (US Pub: 2003/0077097).

Regarding claim 7 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Nishiyama further teaches: A method

according to claim 1, further comprising: a condition obtaining step of obtaining

condition information in which conditions in which the information regarding the image

processing apparatus is displayed and conditions in which the information is not

displayed have been described [fig. 13, p0067-p0070]. Nishiyama does not execute

display based on the status of an apparatus. Gallacher on the other hand allows a

window to be popped up when a print job has completed [p0024]. In the same field of

endeavor, Parry teaches: a status discriminating step of discriminating whether the

image processing apparatus is in a status (normal or non-error status) where it is

necessary to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus on the

basis of the condition information and the information received in said receiving step;

and a step of finishing the display program if the status discriminating step discriminates

that the image processing apparatus is not in the status [p0041, figs 3. Error message

is displayed when the apparatus is not in normal status.]. Discriminating the status of

an apparatus to activate a display program has been well known and practiced in the art

as prescribed by Parry. Therefore, given Nishiyama's teachings on user condition and

identification, Gallacher's teaching on pop-up display, and Parry's disclosure on

apparatus status for activating a display program, it would have been obvious for an

ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the all to display printing

information when both user condition and apparatus status are met for providing user

relevant error messages on the related printing jobs.

Claim 8 (Currently Amended) has been analyzed and rejected with regard to

claim 7. (No message is sent to a computer for displaying when it is determined that

there is no error associated with the image processing apparatus [fig. 13, p0067-

p0070].)

6.   **Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Gallacher (US Pub: 2003/0227647), Nishiyama (US Pub: 2002/0036790), Calaway

(US Pub: 2002/0012134), and Tsao (US Patent: 7,418,702); and in further view of

Hamada (US Pub: 2002/0103885).

Regarding claim 13 (Currently Amended), the rationale applied to the rejection

of claim 1 has been incorporated herein. Gallacher, Nishiyama, Calaway, and Tsao do

not explicitly disclose activating a print service program upon obtaining the information

regarding the image processing apparatus. In the same field of endeavor, Hamada

teaches: A method according to claim 1, wherein the predetermined user is a user for

the user session in which a print service program can be activated in the information

processing apparatus upon receiving the information regarding the image processing

apparatus [p0117 (A print service program such as re-sending data is activated upon

obtaining error information regarding a printer once a predetermined user authenticity is

checked.)]. Given Nishiyama's prescription on detecting error information of a printer in

p0003 and Hamada's disclosure on activating a data re-sending program, it would have

been obvious for an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of

Gallacher, Nishiyama, Calaway, and Tsao to include a print service program upon

obtaining information regarding a printer's status after performing user authentication for

providing user an efficient printing process service.

Contact

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Fan Zhang whose telephone number is (571) 270-3751.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00-5:00.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-7653. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Fan Zhang/

Patent Examiner

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625